



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

187
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,745	01/17/2000	Loredana Abramo	Abramo-1	8778
7590	12/09/2005			
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP 1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE SEVENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/483,745	ABRAMO, LOREDANA	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 11/15/05 to the application filed on 1/17/00.
2. Claims 1-12, 15-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 19 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-12, 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Bellamy, Jr. in view of Probert, Jr. have been withdrawn in view of the supplemental Declaration filed on 11/15/05, which is effective to overcome the US Patent No. 6,259,907 (Bellamy, Jr.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-12, 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAllister et al. (US Pat No. 6,317,484, 11/13/01, filed 4/8/98) view of Probert, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,549,918 B1, 4/15/03, filed 9/21/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, McAllister discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database (col 7, lines 44-64, col 9, line 61 to col 10, line 7, col 16, lines 27-54)
- storing the call which is the raw cellular information in a database (col 8, lines 16-46, col 16, lines 27-54)

McAllister does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*, including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into McAllister since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into McAllister for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in McAllister into the spreadsheet format for easily performing calculations relating to business.

McAllister and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified McAllister and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to McAllister and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, McAllister discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (col 7, lines 44-64: the programmable digital switches in the central office switching system for loading or receiving profiles over a signaling link implies that the digital switch is installed before receiving, converting and outputting)
- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a New Product Introduction test (col 7, lines 44-64)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, McAllister discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (col 7, lines 44-64: the programmable digital switches in the central office

switching system for loading or receiving profiles over a signaling link implies that the digital switch is installed before receiving, converting and outputting)
- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer Acceptance test (col 7, lines 44-64)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, McAllister discloses:

- using the output of said converter as a layout, preparing scripts containing Database Modification Commands (col 5, line 50 to col 6, line 6, col 17, lines 26-58: using scripts in transferring profile data)
- transferring said scripts to said digital switch (col 5, lines 59-67, col 17, lines 26-58)
- via said digital switch, executing said scripts to modify a switch database associated with the raw switch data (col 18, line 17 to col 19, line 20)

Claims 5-6 include the same limitations as in claim 4, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 7 is for a system of claim 12, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Bellamy and Probert do not explicitly disclose the operation of said data receiver, data converter and data output device are

adapted to be triggered via a user's "Make Workbook" command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Probert to include the user's Make Workbook command since it was well known that spreadsheet has the command such as AutoFormat for formatting a workbook, which is a form of the Make Workbook command.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, McAllister discloses that the switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new product installation data (col 14, lines 59-63: compare the received data to its stored template or feature data to identify a calling party shows that said data is testing data).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, McAllister further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data (col 11, lines 22-45: subscriber's profile at the switching system is modified to forwarding calls for the subscriber shows the recent change and verify data of said modified profile).

Claims 11-12, which are dependent on claim 7, include the same limitations as in claims 9-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, McAllister discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switch (col 7, lines 56-64, col 9, line 61 to col 10, line 7, col 16, lines 27-54: receiving incoming messages from the switching system)

Bellamy does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*, including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into McAllister since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into McAllister for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Bellamy into the spreadsheet format.

McAllister and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified McAllister and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to McAllister and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, McAllister discloses:

- using the output of said converter as a layout, preparing scripts containing Database Modification Commands (col 5, line 50 to col 6, line 6, col 17, lines 26-58: using scripts in transferring profile data)
- transferring said scripts to said digital switch (col 5, lines 59-67, col 17, lines 26-58)
- via said digital switch, executing said scripts to modify a switch database associated with the raw switch data (col 18, line 17 to col 19, line 20)

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Bellamy discloses that the switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new product installation data (col 14, lines 59-63: compare the received data to its stored template or feature data to identify a calling party shows that said data is testing data).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 15, Bellamy further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data (col 11, lines 22-45: subscriber's profile at the switching system is modified to forwarding calls for the subscriber shows the recent change and verify data of said modified profile).

Claims 19, 21-22 are for an apparatus of method claims 15-18, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 20 includes the same limitation of apparatus claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schild et al. (US Pat No. 4,017,840).

Shin et al. (US Pat No. 6,259,698).

White et al. (US Pat No. 6,711,241).

Bartholomew et al. (US Pat No. 6,285,745).

Elliott et al. (US Pat App Pub No.2002/0064149 A1).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
12/01/05